

05/17/04 15:44

703 610 8622

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

001/004

MAY 17 2004

OFFICIAL

FACSIMILE

MILES & STOCKBRIDGE P.C.

1751 Pinnacle Drive, Suite 500, McLean, VA 22102-3833 • 703.903.9000 • Fax: 703.610.8686

To M. Robinson--c/o Patent and Trademark Office, GAU 2872

Fax no. (703) 872-9306

Phone no.

From Nelson H. Shapiro

Phone no. (703) 610-8687

Date May 17, 2004

Time

File no. 09/615,081

Pages including cover 4

Message

Confidentiality Notice • The information in this transmission is intended only for the individual or entity named above. It may be legally privileged and confidential. If you have received this information in error, notify us immediately by calling our operator at the number set forth below. Send the original transmission to us by mail. Return postage is guaranteed. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication or its contents is strictly prohibited. If you do not receive all pages or have any problems with receiving this transmission, please call.

MAY 17 2004

OFFICIAL

XA-9335

PATENT APPLICATION

Response Under 37 C.F.R. 1.116
Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2872

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Yutaka SUENAGA et al.

Appln. No.: 09/615,081

Group Art Unit: 2872

Filed: July 12, 2000

Examiner: M. Robinson

For: CATADIOPTIC OPTICAL SYSTEM AND EXPOSURE
APPARATUS EQUIPPED WITH THE SAME

* * *

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL REJECTION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Attn: Mail Stop AF

Sir:

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested
for the reasons which follow.

Claims 85-97 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §
102(b) as being anticipated by Furter 5,742,436 and
Claims 98 and 99 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §
103(a) as being unpatentable over Furter in view of
Williamson 5,956,192.

As explained to the Examiner in a telephone conference today, independent Claim 85 (the only rejected independent claim) recites, inter alia, that all mirrors belonging to the reduction projection catadioptric optical system are devoid of planar folding mirrors. The Examiner has correctly observed that Furter teaches that the folding mirror (5) may be eliminated, but it is respectfully submitted that splitter surface 15 serves as a folding mirror that cannot be eliminated. Splitter surface 15 clearly serves to bend the optical axis of a lens group 200 so that this optical axis may coincide with that of a concave mirror 19. Thus, it is believed to be clear that splitter surface 15 constitutes a folding mirror (which deflects an optical axis), rendering the Furter patent inappropriate in rejecting Claim 85, and the claims dependent thereon.

For the foregoing reasons, this application is now believed to be clearly in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this

paper and has not been requested separately, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NHS:lmb

By: Nelson H. Shapiro
Nelson H. Shapiro
Reg. No. 17,095

Miles & Stockbridge P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive
Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 903-9000

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Nelson H. Shapiro
Nelson H. Shapiro

May 17, 2004
Date